





SPEECH

OF

HENRY DRUMMOND, Esq. M.P.

IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS,

ON THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 1851,

ON THE

Second Reading of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill.

WITH A PREFACE AND NOTES.

Second Edition.

LONDON :

THOMAS BOSWORTH, 215 REGENT STREET.

LONDON:
Printed by G. BARCLAY, Castle St. Leicester Sq.

PREFACE.

Rev. April /57

SOME of the Roman Catholic laity say that they are aggrieved by having the claims of Popish priests to domineer over every baptized man, rejected, and their various impostures exposed. It will be well, therefore, to place the question at issue, in a clear point of view.

The Pope, by means of Cardinal Wiseman, twelve bishops, and sundry priests, has presumed to issue a manifesto by which he pretends to abolish and set aside the ancient English Sees appointed by our Saxon kings, and to constitute other Sees. This is an insult to the Queen, and an aggression on the sovereign prerogative of the British crown.

He has declared all the inhabitants of this country in rebellion against him ; and to be out of the pale of salvation, however sound their faith in Christ, and however blameless their lives. This is an insult to all the people.

He and his coadjutors have declared their intention to reduce the English people to subjection under them ; to establish their semi-religious and semi-secular tyranny ; which they declare to be a system of doctrine, discipline, and practice, complete as a whole and perfect in all its details. We say that we will not submit to them ; that all which is true in their system is equally held by every episcopal Church ; that they have erected upon that common Catholic truth, an immense superstructure of Popish falsehood and imposture, that this falsehood and imposture we do reject, and are determined to expose upon all occasions, in order to make the people aware of its enormities.

The Reformation was produced by circumstances partly religious and partly political. It was resisted by the Papists, who were therefore deprived by the government of various privileges ; they broke out frequently in rebellion, to which they were always encouraged by the Pope, who sent indulgences to those who should die fighting against the government. For nearly a hundred years they had been quiet : their privileges were gradually restored, and at last, in 1829, a final peace was concluded, the Protestants agreeing to share their privileges with the Papists, and the Papists agreeing not to subvert the Protestant institutions.

The Papists have now broken this treaty. They have declared that they have begun a crusade against England, and that the Established Church is an enemy to Jesus Christ. They pretend to justify their present conduct by saying that all churches which have faith are aggressive, and try to propagate their opinions, and that they are in

this respect only like Protestant Dissenters. There is, however, no sort of analogy between these cases. It is true, that every individual who feels the value of religion will endeavour to impart as much as he can to others : but no Protestant, whether Anglican, Presbyterian, Independent, Baptist, Wesleyan, or even member of the Greek church, or of any other, says, that there is no salvation out of their sect. They state the truth of the faith in Christ independent of all questions of Church government or discipline. But the Papists care very little about either faith or morals in comparison to recruiting converts to their own sect, and increasing the number of slaves to the priests. They want to strengthen a worldly party for worldly ends ; to the strengthening of which, spiritual truth is used merely as a means : the ends in view being the subjugation of the civil authority, and the forcing it to be exercised by creatures of their own. Hence while Protestant sects can live in harmony and peace with each other, Protestants cannot live at peace with hostile and aggressive Papists, such as they have now become in England.

In every part of this contest the Papists are the aggressors, and from them must the overtures for peace come. They have attacked us, and we are beating them back. We openly deny the right of the priests to withhold from the laity the Epistles which God directed St. Paul to write to them : we refuse to tell a lie at their dictation, and to say that there is no bread in our mouths when we taste it there in the Holy Communion : we will not submit to have a priest as our director to controul us in all we do : we assert that responsibility for every

action is a part of man's moral being, with which he was endowed at his creation, and with which he may not part to any man, priest, church, or thing: we will not tell a falsehood, and say that black is white, or white is black, whenever the priest tells us: we had rather be deprived of the sacraments than suffer a priest to hold filthy conversation with us at his discretion, or with the female members of our families: we will not pray to dead men and women as mediators between God and man: we will not suffer priests to defraud children of their inheritance by robbing their parents on their death-beds; nor impose upon the simplicity and confidence of young women to lock them up for life in convents, and confiscate their property: and we will drag into open day their imposture in pretending to show to the credulity of the ignorant, bits of the wooden cross of Christ, the veil,* and hair,† and shift of the Virgin Mary, &c. &c. &c.

The Pope converts bishops from vicars-apostolic into ordinary bishops, in order thereby to introduce the canon law of Rome as the rule for Roman Catholic laymen, which he has been trying to do ever since the Conquest, and which our Roman Catholic ancestors would never permit him to do; because the bishops thereby become the disposers of all the funds for the support of the chapelries which are in the gift of the Roman Catholic laity, and are, for the most part, attached to their dwelling-houses. But the Roman Catholic laity are kept in ignorance by the priests, who, under pretence of conducting their education, do inculcate little, except a habit

* Church of Santa Croce, at Rome.

† Church of Santa Prasside, at Rome.

of slavish obedience to themselves, so that they are not aware of the nature of the change which is now brought about. This is a stretch of the old priestly tyranny which chiefly affects the Roman Catholic laity : but it is very doubtful, whether it is possible for the constitutional principle of self-government to be carried on by a people, who voluntarily submit to be ruled by priests, and by a law which they contend to be of superior authority to those laws which bind the sovereign, the nobility, and all the other people of the land : in other words, whether Papists can exist under a constitutional government, without overthrowing it.

The Roman Catholic laity have also to consider, whether, if they submit to tell lies at the bidding of the priests, even to the denying of the evidence of their senses,* it be possible for the superstitious millions to be trusted on their oaths as jurymen and witnesses in any question wherein the priests assume to be interested. To say that the educated classes will not perjure themselves, is to say nothing : the educated classes are as few as the wealthy, and possess no influence whatever over the masses ; nor is education incompatible with superstition. Give a cock to Esculapius, said a dying philosopher. Austria has united with the Jesuits for the purpose of overthrowing all constitutional governments, and the Pope has attacked Bavaria as he has England. The Jesuits are now, for the first time, masters of the Pope and of the whole Romish Church : now, for the

* Amongst a very extensive acquaintance of Roman Catholic laymen in Germany, France, and Italy, I never found one who did not reject the teaching of the priests upon this point.

first time, has the doctrine of a director been attempted to be imposed on all the laity : now, for the first time, is the immoral theology of the Jesuits, refuted by Pascal,—declared by all the Roman Catholic sovereigns of Europe to be incompatible with the safety of their states,—scouted by all the laity of France and Italy, and condemned by the Pope who suppressed their order, brought into England to be the guide of all Romish priests. The Roman Catholic laity had better reflect on these things, rather than lend themselves as tools in the vain attempt to convert a nation, the greater part of whom would prefer to renounce every semblance of a church rather than submit to the tyranny, fraud, and deceptions of Rome.

S P E E C H,

&c. &c.

I CANNOT consent to confine the subject of this discussion within the narrow limits which the honourable member who has just sat down would prescribe for it: the question which we have to decide is no less than this,—Whether the Papists shall remain a tolerated sect under the dominion of the Queen? or, Whether the Queen shall become a licensed heretic under the dominion of the Pope? We have further to determine,—Whether we would have one-third of the inhabitants of this empire, under the pretext of “a religious development necessary to their system,” governed by a law unknown to, and unrecognised by, the remaining two-thirds, and which that one-third part maintains to be superior to both the common and statute law which govern alike the whole community? These questions will not be terminated by this night’s debate, nor by this bill, nor by a hundred such; for the Pope has raised a storm in this country which will never be allayed again in the lifetime of the youngest person present.

Before engaging, however, with the main body of the Pope’s army, I must say something to the skirmishers who have been thrown out in the front of the battle. And the first of these to which I would direct your attention, is the philosophers, who, elevating themselves into a position from which they affect to look down upon all sublunary contests, care little, like

the Turk, whether the hog eat the dog, or the dog the hog — whether the Papist eat the Protestant, or the Protestant the Papist — and recommend us to stand aloof, to do nothing, but allow all things to take their course. It is a pity that these philosophers did not think the same two years ago; for they then did condescend to come down from their height, and meddle with a bill that was sent up from this House; and gave as a reason for inserting a clause which has justly offended the Pope, that they would not allow him to send an *alter ego* here; and now the Pope, instead of sending an *alter ego*, has sent a part of himself,—*pars ipsius corporis*, as a cardinal is called. We are indebted to an Irish writer for showing us the real value of philosophers in all sublunary matters; and whoever has read the “Voyage to Laputa,” can have no difficulty in estimating the worth of philosophers in all that relates to the conduct of mankind.

I must, in the next place, warn the House against supposing that the Roman Catholic members are better acquainted with the details of Popery than any others. I am sure that the honourable member for Cork (Mr. Fagan) is as incapable of saying anything which he does not believe to be true as any member of this House; nevertheless, he did distinctly deny, during a late debate, that there was any difference between the Court of Rome and the Church of Rome: this was refuted; yet, nevertheless, at a subsequent period in the debate, up jumps the honourable member for Dublin, and repeats the same thing. But what does Dr. M'Hale say?—and surely both these gentlemen must bow down to him—he says, in his evidence before the Education Committee, “The doctrine and principles of the *Court* of Rome are not sufficient to establish the doctrine of the Catholic *Church*; we distinguish between the *Court* of Rome and the *See* of Rome; for the *Court* of Rome may be a scene of much intrigue and cabal, without affecting, at the same time, the authority of the Holy *See*, or decrees of the Catholic

“Church.” This is sufficient to show that the Roman Catholic members do not know the doctrines of their own Church, and that the statement which I made concerning that difference was correct.* Yet Dr. Wiseman declares that “it is the law of this country that divides the sovereign of the Roman states from the Bishop of Rome.” Of all the impostures which are put forth by the Papacy, there is none more false than that it is unchanged and unchangeable; for it has been continually changing, and every change was to give increased power to the priests, and to take away some right from the laity. The philosophers who tell us to let such a system alone, had better remember the words of a French minister to the Senate in the time of the First Consul, who said, “The Catholic religion is that of the vast majority of the French nation; to abandon so powerful an engine would be to desire the first ambitious knave or unprincipled demagogue who wishes to convulse France, to seize it, and direct it against his country.” For “France,” read “Ireland.”

The object to be attained by the Papacy has never been lost sight of, and it retains the same means of effecting its ends which it ever had. It has been said that it is ridiculous to make such a fuss about an Italian priest, who is totally without power, save over the consciences of those who choose to believe in him. But the Pope has the same arms which he ever had. He never has had an army—he never has had a fleet—yet he has contrived to do as much mischief in Europe, to shed as much blood in battle, as Napoleon, or anybody else. He has kept his arms, but we have thrown away ours, with which we in former times successfully resisted him. It is asked, with infantile simplicity, “In

* It is true, however, that the Popes and Court of Rome have never admitted the distinction. The priests assert it at one time when they have some point to gain, and deny it at another when they have none such in view. So that neither their denial nor their admission is to be trusted.

“ what way can his present act be called an aggression?
 “ It is only a spiritual reconstitution, or developement,
 “ of our hierarchical system.” These are very pretty
 words, but if this be all that is required, how came the
 Pope to send here a cardinal?—a cardinal is not a
 spiritual person. It is so long since we have had a
 gentleman of this description in this country, that people
 have forgotten what sort of animal he is. Now I will
 show you what a cardinal is in the words of a Pope
 himself. There was in France, in the reign of Louis
 XIV., a certain Cardinal Bouillon, a very worthless
 fellow, whom the king sent away : upon this the Pope
 wrote to his legate to tell the king, that “ it had never
 “ entered into the mind of the Pope to dispute the
 “ power of his most Christian Majesty to dismiss from
 “ his service those ministers and servants of whose con-
 “ duct his majesty is not satisfied, but only that his
 “ majesty *could not send away an ecclesiastic, and far*
 “ *less a cardinal* : and this not on account of any
 “ affection for Cardinal Bouillon, who has not applied for
 “ aid to his holiness, but out of the *zeal which he ought to*
 “ *have for the immunities of sacred persons and things.*
 “ With regard to other ecclesiastics, these, indeed, are born
 “ subjects of the king ; but *so soon as they receive any*
 “ *orders from the Church, they become exempt from all*
 “ *lay power, in order to become subjects solely to the*
 “ *Apostolic See*, and the king is endangering his eternal
 “ *salvation if he thinks otherwise.*” Such then is the faith
 of the priests of one-third of the population of Great
 Britain and Ireland ; this is what they are endeavouring
 to establish by all their labours, by all their conver-
 sions, by all their insinuations into families, and decoying
 of the inexperienced. Bearing in mind this claim of the
 Pope for his priests, let us see the oath which the
 cardinal takes to the Pope, “ I promise and swear, that
 “ I from this time forward, so long as I shall live, will
 “ be faithful and obedient to blessed Peter, and the
 “ Holy Roman Apostolic Church, and to our most holy
 “ lord the Pope and his successors, and will fight for

“their honour and standing *against all*, with all my “endeavours, and all my powers.” If any one will take the oath of allegiance to the Queen also, he must intend to lie to one or to the other; the two engagements are incompatible.*

With such instruments then, a cardinal sworn to fight for him against all others, and a body of bishops and priests “exempt from all lay power, and subject “only to the Apostolic See,” the Pope proceeds to abrogate, annul, and destroy all the Sees of England, which have been established by the monarchs of England, from the days of King Ethelbert,—a proclamation, such as the Queen herself dare not issue, and such as the Pope would not have dared to have sent to any other country than this. These are his words: “Whatever “regulations, either in the ancient system of the Anglican “Churches;” (that is, before the Reformation) “or in “the subsequent missionary state,” (that is, subsequent to the Reformation) “may have been in force either by “special constitutions, or privileges, or peculiar customs, “*will now henceforth carry no right nor obligation*: and, “in order that no doubt may remain on this point, we,

* This is proved further by the fact, that a cardinal, even when a child (for to suit their infamous purposes, such things have occurred), is emancipated from his father's control. “Freedom “from paternal authority belongs to the assumption of the dignity “of cardinal. Nor, indeed, is it fitting that that son of the Church, “who is made brother, help and counsellor of Christ's vicar on earth, “should still remain under parental authority.”—*Cohellius, Not. Pro.* vi. It is said by some, that there is no occasion for a cardinal to take an oath; whether he do or not, the obligation remains the same. It is probable that in the instance of Cardinal Wiseman, he may not have taken the oath, on purpose to be able to deny it if challenged in this country on the subject, just as he says, the persecuting clauses were exempted from the oath which he took as archbishop; which is a mere piece of priestly jugglery and duplicity. The original words of the oath, are these:—“Ego S. R. E. Cardinalis N. “promitto et juro, me ab hâc horâ deinceps quamdiu vixero, fidelem “et obedientem beato Petro, Sanctæque Apostolicæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, “ac sanctissimo Domino nostro Papæ ejusque successoribus, &c. “&c., adversus omnes, honorem et statum eorum omni studio et totis “viribus propugnaturum,” &c.

“ by the plenitude of our Apostolic authority, repeal and
 “ abrogate all power whatsoever of imposing obligation,
 “ or conferring right in those peculiar constitutions and
 “ privileges of whatsoever kind they may be, and in all
 “ customs by whomsoever or at whatsoever most ancient
 “ and immemorial time brought in,” (that is, by our
 “ Saxon monarchs). “ Hence, it will, for the future, be
 “ *solely competent for the archbishop and bishops,*”
 (hereby setting aside all the rights of the priests and
 laity) “ *to distinguish* what things belong to the execution
 “ of the common ecclesiastical law, and what according
 “ to the common discipline of the Church are entrusted
 “ to the authority of the bishops.” When Augustine
 came to England, having been consecrated a bishop in
 France, the King gave him a See, first in London, and
 then removed him to Canterbury. Yet, a recent pastoral
 of Dr. M‘Hale has the presumption, in defiance of the
 plain words of history, to assert that the Pope appointed
 Canterbury to Augustine. In those days Popes were
 kept in better order than to dare to parcel out kingdoms
 without the consent of their respective sovereigns ; there
 is no instance of any Pope daring to set up a See of his
 own will, nor to abolish one ; but it is hard to meet
 with one of these bishops’ pastorals, that does not contain
 direct falsehoods, and perversion of facts intended to
 deceive. Unfortunately, such being the arrogant aggres-
 sion which Cardinal Wiseman and the priests are
 appointed to carry out, there are never wanting parties
 to uphold him. So long ago as 1846, a popish organ
 declared as follows : “ Calm your perturbation, ye excel-
 “ lent individuals, and submit with decent dignity to the
 “ inevitable. It is even so. It will be so yet more and
 “ more ; you are only at the beginning of your perplexity.
 “ The Pope will speak more loudly than ever, and, what
 “ is more, HE will be listened to. HE will turn over
 “ your musty Acts of Parliament, with finger and thumb,
 “ scrutinizing them with a most irreverent audacity ;
 “ examining those which concern him,” (how can acts of
 a British Parliament concern him unless he be a foreign

intruder into our concerns?) “and when he has found these, rejecting some and tolerating others, with as much freedom as you use when you handle oranges in a shop, selecting the soft and the sweet, contemptuously rejecting the sour and rotten. And then—O dreadful thought!—HE will insist upon being obeyed.” (Yes, and will be obeyed by traitors, and can be obeyed by none else.) “What! the bill was read three times in each House of Parliament; it was thrice passed; engrossed on parchment; garnished with a waxen appendage, by way of seal; and has had read over it pronounced by royal lips, the mysterious and creative fiat, *La Reine veut*. The Queen wills it; the Lords will it; the Commons will it. What does it want to complete the perfect fashion of a law? Nothing of solemnity, nothing of force, which the imperial sceptre of this kingdom could give, is wanting to it. But truly it may want the sanction of religion: the Pope,” (so he is religion) “snuffs disdainfully at it: an *Italian priest* will have none of it: it trenches upon *his rights*,” (how can an Italian have rights in Britain?) “or rather upon his duties; it violates the integrity of those interests which he is set to guard; and, therefore, Commons, Lords, Queen, wax, parchment, and all, avail it very little. You may call it law if you please. You may enter it on your roll. You may print it in the yearly volume of your statutes. But before long you will have to repeal, or alter it, in order to procure the sanction of a foreign potentate, without which it has not in the end the value of a tenpenny nail.”

Such is the amount of loyalty which is avowed by the servants of the Pope; and let it be remarked, that he and religion are held to be synonymous. The priests always call themselves “religion” in contradistinction to the laity, but it would be well for the laity to remind them of that which M. Isambert said respecting them, “You call yourselves religion, but we will make you understand that religion is one thing, and you are another thing.”

There is another class of persons who object to any opposition by law against the Pope's aggression, which is the class of Utilitarians. One of these gentlemen said lately at a public meeting, "If the Roman Catholics were to come to Parliament and say, 'The head of our Church has given us bishops, and we ask you to give these bishops power by law to enforce their jurisdiction,' then, I should say, that such a demand should be visited with the most strenuous opposition:" and again, "Tell me in what way these Roman Catholic bishops will interfere with *my* civil liberty, with *my* religious opinions, or with *my* purse." We have been accustomed to hear much of the selfishness in this sect of Utilitarians in what relates to the food of the people; they would open the trade in corn, because it increased the export of cotton, but they would not say a word in favour of malt, because cotton was not to be benefited; and now they have gone a step farther, and declared that no one was to be protected if these Utilitarians themselves did not happen to want protection. But did you so act towards Negro slaves? Did they ask for protection? Did the factory children ask for protection? Do idiots, or insane persons, ask for protection? How can a poor young lady who is locked up, where she may be either starved or whipped to death, that the priests may clutch her money, ask for protection? (*Here was considerable interruption, and cries of "No, no."*) I assert that nunneries are prisons, and I have seen them so used. (*Again violent cries of "No, no."*) They have ever been either prisons or brothels.*

* This characteristic of the monastic system was not within the scope of my argument, and therefore it would have been better not then to have mentioned it. Nothing but the grossest ignorance of ecclesiastical history, as well as of the literature of the middle ages, could justify the denial of its truth, as the following few instances, which happen to be at hand, will prove.

1.—"In A.D. 673, the Council of Cloveshoe found it necessary to order that the monasteries should not be turned into places of amusement for harpers and buffoons; and that laymen should not be admitted within their walls too freely, lest they might be scandalised at the

(The Earl of Arundel here rose to order, and said that the ladies in nunneries devoted themselves to the service of God, by pursuing and endeavouring to attain to the perfection of all human virtues.)

offences they should discover there, for sufficiently injurious and vicious is that custom of familiarity with laymen, particularly in the monasteries of nuns less strictly kept: because on this account not only causes of divers and nefarious suspicion arise, but they are propagated and repeated to the disgrace of our profession. Wherefore let not the cells of the nuns be the abodes of shameful talking, drunkenness, and luxury."—*Wilkins' Concilia*, i. 97. "Most of the monasteries in England, too, were double houses, in which resided communities of men and women."—*Bede, Epist. ad Egbert*.

2.—A.D. 730. "And we are informed that, which is worse, this crime of greatest magnitude (fornication and adultery) is committed with nuns throughout the convents, and with virgins dedicated to God. . . . It is to be noted that in that crime (fornication) another great wickedness lies; because whilst those harlots, whether lay or nuns (*illæ meretrices sive seculares sive monasteriales*), produce offspring wickedly conceived in sin, they often, for the most part, kill them; not filling the church of Christ with adopted sons, but satiating the grave with bodies, and hell with miserable souls."—*Epist. of Boniface to Ethelbald. Wilkins' Concilia*, i. 88.

3.—Bede, a great panegyrist of monks, tells of a vision which a man related to the abbess of a "monastery of virgins," at Coldingham, before it was burned down, in which he says, "I having now visited all this monastery regularly, have looked into every one's chambers and beds, and found none of them, all besides yourself, being about the care of his soul; but all of them, both men and women, either indulge themselves in slothful sleep, or are awake in order to commit sin; for even the cells that were built for prayers and reading, are now converted into places of feasting, drinking, talking, and other delights; the very virgins dedicated to God laying aside the respect due to their profession, whensoever they are at leisure, apply themselves to weaving fine garments, either to use in adorning themselves like brides, to the danger of their condition, or to gain the friendship of strange men."—*Bede*, iv. c. 25.

4.—Bede, exhorting a bishop to reform the wickedness of the clergy, says: "For disgraceful though it be to say it, so many estates have been received under the name of monasteries by those who know nothing whatever of the monastic life, as you yourselves know better than I, that the sons of the nobles, or of distinguished soldiers, can find no place wherever to receive their possessions; and thus having nothing to do, and not marrying, though past the age of puberty, they are held by no tie of continence; and, therefore, either go beyond the sea and abandon their country, which they

I will show you presently what is "the perfection of "all human virtue," in the minds and instructions of priests, and towards which the laity are advanced. In the meantime, I will show you that so far is the assertion

"ought to fight for; or, with still greater wickedness and impudence, "not being bound by chastity, become addicted to luxury and fornication, and do not abstain even from the very virgins who are dedicated to God (*neque ab ipsis sacratis Deo virginibus abstineant*)." —i. 127.

Lingard, in speaking of the double monasteries of monks and nuns, says that the monks were only servants of the abbess; but the many councils and orders of bishops prohibiting men to go into the convents on any pretext show that the rank of the males signified little.

5.—"By the first Synod of St. Patrick it is enacted, that a monk and a nun should not lodge together, or gossip."—*Wilkins' Concilia*, i.

6.—"Many nobles desirous of an uninterrupted life of sensuality, pretended to devote their wealth to the service of heaven, and obtained the royal sanction for founding a religious house; but in their new character of abbots, they gathered round them a brotherhood of dissolute monks, with whom they lived in the commission of every vice; while their wives, following the example, established nunneries upon a similar principle, and filled them with the most depraved of their sex."

7.—That monasteries were double houses, appears from many collateral proofs; for example, in Bede, A.D. 676, we find "when "the mortality had also seized on that part of this monastery where "the men resided, and they were daily hurried away to meet their "God, the careful mother of the Society began often to inquire in "the convent, of the sisters, where they would have their bodies "buried—when the same pestilence should fall upon that part of the "monastery in which God's female servants (*ancillarum Dei caterva*) "were divided from the men," &c.

The first point in the papacy is to prevent such crimes from coming to light, and therefore, the best evidence of the condition of religious houses is found in the continued regulations for suppressing evil, which even the most flagitious popes were obliged to adopt.

8.—787. "The Council of Nice prohibited double monasteries of men and women. . . . It also prohibited monks from sleeping in the convents."—*Eccl. Hist.* v. 544.

9.—789. "Small monasteries of girls, where the rule is not kept, shall be united to large; they shall be closely confined, and they shall not write love-letters (*billets de galanterie*)."—*Ibid.* 553.

10.—829. "Canons and monks shall not enter convents of girls without the consent of the bishops; . . . if it is to hear confessions,

in the pastorals of the bishops, that neither priests nor laity require protection, from being true, both priests and laity have petitioned against the very measures which the Pope has taken.

it shall be in the church before the altar in the presence of witnesses who shall not be far off."—*Ibid.* vii. p. 193.

11.—1177. "Thirty nuns, of the monastery of Ambesbury, were accused and convicted for their unclean lives, whereupon the king, having expelled the nuns for their incontinence, distributed them in other houses to be more strictly guarded."—*Confirmed by Pope Alexander III., Prynne*, ii. 228.

12.—1219. "The esteem which the Pope had for the capacity of Domenick made him select him for a work which he thought very difficult; namely, to collect in one house all the nuns spread over different parts of Rome, in order more easily to govern and keep them. . . . He had three cardinals to assist him, . . . they found a great resistance from all the nuns accustomed to a bad liberty; he, however, at last succeeded."—*Eccl. Hist.*

13.—1212. "Since the nuns were not yet in close convents, priests or servants of whom there was the smallest suspicion, were not allowed to be left with them, nor were their relatives suffered to visit them It was condemned as an abuse to give to each one a small allowance of money for their food and raiment, so small that they were constrained to seek to supply the deficiency sometimes by a disgraceful trade (*un trafic honteux*). The abbesses and chaplains of the nuns forbid them to confess to anybody but to them, fearing that their sins should come to the ears of virtuous priests, who would punish them."—*Ibid.*

14.—1228. "I enjoin on all monks not to have suspected companies of women and to enter convents of nuns, except those to whom a special license has been given: and not to make companies of men or of women lest scandal should arise."—*Matt. Paris*, p. 344.

15.—1417. "It now remains to speak only of nuns; but shame forbids our saying much concerning them, lest we should make a long discourse, not of a band of virgins, but rather of harlots, of the arts and wantonness of strumpets, of lewd and incestuous deeds. For what, I pray you, are at this time convents of girls other than,—I do not say sanctuaries of God, but execrable stews of Venus? but receptacles for satiating the lusts of lascivious and immodest youths, that it is the same thing for a girl to take the veil as to expose herself as a public prostitute."—*Nicholaus de Clemangis*.
 "Restant nunc solæ moniales: de his autem plura dicere verecundia
 "prohibet, ne non de cœtu virginum, sed magis de lupanaribus, de
 "dolis ac procætia meretricum, de stupris et incestuosis operibus
 "dandum sermonem prolixè trahamus. Nam quid obsecro aliud
 "sunt hoc tempore puellarum monasteria nisi quædam, non dico Dei

The noble lord said on a former evening, that he had, with several others, signed a petition for the very measure which has been granted. He has not, however, shown us that petition: still if he says that he has

“sanctuaría, sed Veneris execranda prostibula? sed lascivorum et impudicorum juvenum ad libidines explendas receptacula, ut idem hodie sit puellam velare quod et publice ad scortandum exponere.”

Bruy, speaking of Clemangis, says, “Par pudeur il aime mieux tirer le rideau sur les abominations qui se commettoient dans leurs couvents, qu’il appelle les bordels de Venus, aujourd’hui voiler une fille c’est la prostituer.”—iii. 610, 611.

16.—1536. The commissioners appointed by Henry VIII. to enquire into the state of the monasteries, reported that “monstrous disorders were found in many of the religious houses. Whole convents of women abandoned to lewdness; signs of abortion procured, of infants murdered, of unnatural lusts between persons of the same sex.” This would be suspicious testimony if it were not confirmed by the report of the commissioners appointed by the Pope Paul III. in the following year.

17.—1537. “The fifteenth abuse concerns the disorders which are committed in many convents of nuns conducted by monks, and the commissioners say that this cannot be remedied without taking this government from the monks, to give it to others who shall be without suspicion, and with whom the nuns may run no danger.”—*Eccl. Hist.* v. xix.

18.—Mezeray says, the nuns keep neither their cloisters nor their vows: “Les religieuses n’observoient ni leur clôture ni leur vœux.”—i. 263.

19.—In a bull, issued 15th October, 1552, the Pope declared the small convents to be mere receptacles for licentiousness and crime.

20.—When Alexander VII. suppressed the convents in Venice, the Venetians remonstrated; but the Pope said, the existence of these convents was rather an offence than edification to the faithful.—*Ranke*, ii. 385, *Foster’s Translation*.

21.—1642. “A petition was presented by the head magistrate and two hundred knights and gentlemen of Pistoia against the indecent conduct of the nuns in the convents of St. Catherine and St. Lucia with the Dominican monks. Nothing, however, was done till the Bishop Ricci took up the matter in 1778, when disclosures of the most disgusting nature were made; the monks continually sleeping in the convents.”—*Life of Ricci*, Botta, A.D. 1736.

22.—1736. “The convent of *Carmelites Descalzas* at Logroño is memorable in monastic annals, as it was discovered that the friars of an opposite convent had burrowed a tunnel by which they visited the sisters somewhat unspiritually. This commerce continued from the

really petitioned for that which the Pope has done, no doubt he has so petitioned. But then we must say that the petition of the noble lord was exactly the reverse of the petition of other noble lords, and of others of the

year 1712 to 1737 before it was found out; it resulted from an ecclesiastical enquiry, that out of twenty-one nuns, seventeen at one period had repented of their vows of vestal chastity."—FORD'S *Spain*.

23.—“There is now found out, under pretence of religion, a new sort of servitude, which I find practised in the nunneries; you must do nothing but by a rule, and then all that you lose they gain. And to make the slavery yet more evident, you change the habit that your parents gave you, and, after the old example of slavery, bought and sold in the market, you change the very name that was given you in baptism: and that which makes the servitude yet more unhappy is, that you must serve many masters, and they most commonly fools too, and debauchees. But say, I beseech you, by what law are you discharged from the power of your parents? what if you should buy or sell your father's estate, you do not hold it lawful. What right have you, then, to dispose of your parent's child, to I know not whom, his child, which is the dearest and most appropriate part of his possession? If you cannot dispose of so much as a rag, or an inch of ground, so long as you are under the government of your parents, what right can you pretend to for the disposing of yourself into the service of another? Did you not profess yourself a Christian in your baptism? and are not they religious that conform to the precepts of Christ? What new religion is that, then, which pretends to frustrate what the law of nature has established? what the old law taught? what the evangelical law has approved, and what the apostles' doctrine hath confirmed? This is a device that never descended from heaven, but was hatched by a monk in his cell. I am by no means against the main institution of a monastical life, but I would most undoubtedly caution young women (especially those of generous nature) not to precipitate themselves into this gulph, from whence there is no returning, and the rather *because their modesty is more in danger in a cloister than out of it.*”—*Extract from Sir R. L'Estrange's Erasmus.*

24.—“In A.D. 1431, Ambrose, General of the Order of Camaldoli, ‘went to visit several monasteries of his order. He found ‘everywhere an extreme corruption of manners. Some nunneries ‘were perfect bawdy-houses, which we chose to express in Greek ‘rather than in Latin. . . . The abbess owned, at last, that the ‘nuns did not behave as they ought, but that neither she, nor *some* ‘of the most aged sisters, followed the bad example.’”

“In another convent he thought things not so bad as reported, but when he was gone away, he was assured that almost all the nuns of that convent were ladies of pleasure (*omnes fere proventus vivas*). He

Roman Catholic body, for I have here a copy of a petition signed by Lord Petre, Messrs. Riddell, Searle, George Rokewode, Douglas, E. Riddell, Innes, Tempest, Selby, Blount, Jerningham, Scully, T. C. Anstey, and

returned to the convent and found that a friar had debauched a nun, who had made her escape. The abbess owned that she had had a child."

"He left no record in the convent of what he had done lest it should be publicly known; but, in his own report, he says: 'By the account of the convent of our Lord's mother, and of several others, we have found that they are downright bawdy-houses; things have been found even worse than we expected.'"—*Bayle, in voce Camaldoli*.

25.—"A Capucin monk seduced thirteen out of seventeen of the nuns in a convent in which he was confessor."—*Llorente, Hist. of Inquisition. French edition, iii. 44.*

26.—"I have, in the course of my life, come in contact with characters of all descriptions; I have seen the human mind at various stages of elevation and debasement; but *souls* more polluted than those of some of the professed vestals of the Church of Rome never fell within my observation."—*Blanco White, i. 70.*

27.—Orbe. "Here are a town-house and a college which were once two convents of monks and nuns, that were contiguous. There was a little church, common to them both; upon the pulling down whereof, about fifty years ago, there tumbled out as many dry bones of infants as would fill a large basket; and a private trap-door was found, which communicated from one convent to the other."—*Hist. of Switzerland, p. 767.*

28.—"The convent of Sepolte Vive (the buried alive) in Naples, was an inhuman and godless atrocity. These establishments when not converted into clerical seraglios, were at best but abodes of childish imbecility."—*Father Gavazzi, p. 53.*

29.—"Some years ago it was my lot to become acquainted with a Romish bishop (since dead), vicar-apostolic of British Guiana, Dr. Claney. At the period of my acquaintance with him he was about departing from Ireland to his bishopric, and was taking with him a number of nuns for the purpose of founding a convent there. He did succeed in procuring some six or seven females who set sail with him from Dublin. In an incredibly short period after her arrival there, one of the nuns insisted on returning, and threatened an appeal to the British Governor if her request were not complied with. It was granted, and upon her return to Ireland she stated to myself, amongst others, that the revolting scenes she was compelled to witness were the cause of her departure. It will be only necessary to inform my readers that the bishop was confidently reported to have lived in open fornication with the mother abbess,

many others. This petition is addressed "to his Holiness Gregory XVI. in 1839. May it please your Holiness. The gracious attention which it has pleased your Holiness to pay to a petition presented about two

while one of his priests, his vicar-general, became the avowed seducer of another, a young lady of the tender age of eighteen years. . . . But Ireland teems with many such instances; and I am aware of a convent in a town in the west of Ireland, situate close to a Cavalry Barrack, which was the regular resort of all the dissolute officers of the neighbourhood, who used to enter it under the cover of the night, and rarely emerge from it till break of day."—*Extract from a Tract published in Dublin, by R. F. Spillar, formerly a Romanist.*

I can produce the names and addresses of all the writers of the following letters, except one, whenever it may be necessary to do so:—

30.—"March 22, 1851. I heard a Franciscan friar preach a very good sermon, and I went subsequently to visit him in his convent. He gave us fruit and wine in his cell. He afterward offered me the use of his cell for the evening, and to bring any nun I would name out of the adjoining convent."

31.—"Mr. D. was perfectly right in the character which he gave of monastic institutions. I well remember, when I was in Quebec, some thirty-five years ago, one of these nests of iniquity was being taken down, and on clearing away the foundation, a quantity of the bones and remains of infants were found under the pavement in a part of the cellar. It appears that this spot had been used, time immemorial, by the pious sisterhood for the burial-place of the poor beings who had thus been murdered to hide their shame and profligacy. The story soon got to the ears of the Papists, and the affair was hushed up."—*Extract of a Letter from an English Manufacturer in the North of England to a Merchant in London, 29th March, 1851.*

32.—"I was a curate, officiating in the Roman Catholic Chapel of ——. My niece was a boarder or pensioner in the school of the nunnery of —— from the age of four years to the age of eighteen. As her guardian, under her father's will, the duty devolved on me to ascertain from that young lady her intentions relative to her future state of life. I accordingly invited her to breakfast at my lodgings in the chapel-house of that chapel, and said to her, 'Do you intend to return into a nunnery or living in the world?' 'Nunneries,' she replied, 'are not such good places as you imagine: I would not pass my life in one of them for any consideration: as to the nuns they are continually in a state of strife with each other, and the crimes committed by the young ladies are shocking to relate.' I accordingly, with her own approbation, placed her at a boarding-school of the highest reputation in order to qualify her for filling her place in society, where she remained until she married."—*Extract of a Letter from an Ex-Priest, 29th March, 1851.*

“ years ago from a numerous and influential portion of
 “ Catholics of the Northern district of England, praying
 “ for a *sub-division of our districts, election by the rectors,*
 “ *as well secular as regular,* of each congregation, the pro-

33.—“ I had a long audience of leave from the Pope, in 1848, and was charged by His Holiness with a message to a near relative living in a convent in England. On arriving, in June, I went to the convent, and rang at the priest's door; I was told that the priest was not up as he was not well, and I was shown into a parlour. After waiting some time, and fearing that I had been imprudent in asking to see him if he was really indisposed, I went up stairs and opened his bed-room door. The priest was quite well; he was not more than half dressed, and a young nun was standing by him, who, on seeing me, immediately fled; and the priest said that such a thing had never occurred before. I subsequently made a representation to the bishop, who said that the priest was not fit to have the charge of females; but, nevertheless, the priest was not removed.”

34.—“ In the year 1810 I was on the Staff of Sir John Steward commanding in Sicily. During the fruitless attempt of Murat, with his 40,000 Frenchmen to cross the water in that year, several men deserted from the foreign corps then in the British service: among the number, were three grenadiers from the Regiment de Watteville. It was thought that they had joined the French cavalry. The officers knew many jolly priests, and, by frequent supplies of good brandy, they became very communicative, and spoke out very freely. Several hints were thrown out by them with respect to the three grenadiers and a convent just outside the gate of Messina. Our detectives were put upon the scent, and in a short time discovered the soldiers, well clothed, and better fed. On an examination of the nuns, who, we are told by some members of your house, ‘ devote ‘ their whole time to the service of God,’ seven of those ladies were found in the family way, supposed, by the examiners, to be by the three grenadiers, who did afterwards confess to their stall-fed and happy mode of living for nearly seven months.”

35.—“ *Paris, April 3, 1851.* I have enquired of Padre L—— what he knows personally of nunneries in his own country: he tells me that he was confessor of only one for a short time not far from Turin, containing fourteen, and that he was solicited by five of them.”

These instances suffice to prove the truth of my assertion, respecting the general character of nunneries. But let not Protestants imagine that the crimes committed in them are peculiar to Papists. If twenty women are imprisoned, without help or means of redress, and one man have a right to visit them secretly, as often as he please,—still more if they think it a religious duty for him to question them upon all their secret past and present thoughts, long-

“*per appointment of chapters*, and enactment of laws
 “duly considered and approved by the Holy See
 “ cannot but increase our gratitude,” &c.
 &c. These, then, were the things petitioned for two
 years before 1839, and again in that year; but not one

ings, desires, and aspirations, he will seduce them all, let him belong to whatever sect he may. Whatever the faults of nuns may have been, those of popes, priests, and monks, have been immeasurably worse: and the poor women have been made the victims of superstition, cruelty, and lust. In Protestant countries, nunneries are little more than girls' schools; and as under Protestant protection, Papists may talk about religious liberty, so is it probable that nunneries have the Protestant morality which surrounds them. The case is forcibly stated by a French Roman Catholic, with whose words I close:—"The confessor, his victims. What he wants is that she
 "may resemble him. He is alone, then let her be alone. He has
 "no family; he hates her as a wife and mother; he wants to make
 "her a lover, a lover of God. He is deceiving himself, in deceiving
 "her. Fear has much to do with love. The husband in the
 "middle ages was loved by his wife for his very severity. His humble Griselda recognised in him the right of the paternal rod. The
 "bride of William the Conqueror, having been beaten by him, recognised him by this token for her lord and husband. Who has this
 "right in our age? The husband has not preserved it. The
 "priest has it and uses it; he even holds over women the rod of
 "authority. He beats her submissive and docile with spiritual rods.
 "But he who can punish can also pardon. The only one who can
 "be severe, he alone has also, what with a timid person is accounted
 "grace, supreme clemency. One word of pardon gains for him
 "instantly, in that poor frightened heart, more than the worthiest
 "would gain in years of perseverance. Kindness acts just in proportion to the severities and terrors that have preceded it. No seduction is to be compared to this. How can that man be resisted who,
 "to force one to love him, can entice by the offer of Paradise, or
 "frighten by the threat of hell? This unlooked-for return of kindness is a moment of danger for her, who overcome by fear, her
 "head buried in the dust, expected only the fury of the thunderbolt.
 "The formidable judge—the angel of judgment is suddenly melted.
 "She who felt already the cold blade of the sword, feels now the
 "warmth of the gentle hand which raises her from the dust. The
 "transition is too great for her; she had held out against fear; but
 "this gentleness overcomes her. Worn out by her alternations, the
 "feeble woman becomes feebleness itself. . . . To be able to have all,
 "and yet to abstain!—a slippery position. Who can stand firm on
 "such a declivity?"—*Michelet, Prêtre, &c.* p. 308.

of these things is now granted, nor are they contained in the recent act of the Pope. Finding there was even at that time a beginning to work the very mischief that has now taken place, the petition goes on to state, "Our joy, however, has been checked by reports which seem but too well founded, of designs to impede by various means your wise intentions on our behalf. More especially we find that attempts are being made, with the risk of fomenting dissension amongst us, to *deprive us of the expected privilege* of voting in the election of chapters, and of vicars apostolic, those missionaries who belong to religious orders," &c. Thus, then, instead of that act of the Pope being in accordance with the prayer of the petitions of the Catholic laity, it is exactly in the teeth of those prayers.

This, however, is not all. I have here a copy of the petition of the priests, which is as follows:—"We, the undersigned, missionary priests of the Catholic Church in England, humbly and earnestly beseech the Sacred Congregation that *the rank of Bishops in Ordinary may not be granted to the Vicars-Apostolic* of England before that the rights of the parish priests shall have been granted to the missionary priests; . . . and that, *in the first place*, there may be a code of laws touching spiritual things, . . . some part given to the priests in the choice in their bishops, . . . chapters duly constituted in each district, . . . and that stability of place, and that parochial status secured, which hitherto, that is, down to the present generation of Vicars Apostolic, was sanctioned by customary law; the which things not being granted, *the latter state of the afore-said clergy will be worse than the first.*"

Here, then, is proof positive, that the aggression was not made in consequence of petitions from England. Moreover, there is proof that, in defiance of these petitions for a totally different thing, a cabal was going on at Rome, in 1847, in order to do the very thing that has now been done. I have here an extract from a letter written in that year from Rome to Mr. C. Dickens, by a

Roman Catholic priest, under the signature of Savanarola. He writes, in April 1847: "If our intercourse with Rome is in favourable progress, a recent step on the part of your British 'Vicars-Apostolic' is, nevertheless, likely to create an awkward impediment. You are aware that these functionaries, originally four, were doubled during the last years of Gregory, and England is now divided into eight quasi-episcopal districts: viz. Metropolitan, York, Lancaster, Northern, Eastern, Western, Midland, and Wales. Not satisfied with this augmentation of their numbers, the vicarial body is just now in the attitude of Oliver Twist, 'asking for more.' Their new demand is, to have their *locus standi* in England no longer *vicarial*, *i. e.*, removable at the simple will of the Vatican, but diocesan, with permanent, 'ordinary,' and irresponsible jurisdiction. If this were a mere matter of honorific title, and an approximation on the part of the English Roman Catholic prelates to the plenitude of hierarchy existing for the brotherhood in Ireland, it would be offensive only in the nostrils of jealous bigotry; . . . but the proceeding is deemed objectionable on other grounds: as *seriously affecting the Roman Catholic body, clergy as well as laity*, in England. The 'vicars' have not had the grace in seeking to better their own condition, to raise up, by one common effort, their 'beloved clergy,' who are at present dismissible at caprice like themselves. They seek not the salutary control of a *diocesan* dean and chapter, according to the canonical arrangements of Catholic Christendom; they do not relish the assistance of *irremovable* rural deans, appointed for length of service, learning, and piety: no claims of parochial authority, as in Ireland, enter into their project for the 'good of the Church.'

"So far in spirituals; but here's the rub! in temporalities they want to 'carry the bag,' and to get *transferred to their single separate names* the pure and simple proprietorship of all the landed and funded property now vested in lay or clerical trustees, for

" Roman Catholic purposes throughout Great Britain.
 " These accumulated funds, the legacy of by-gone piety,
 " have long been coveted ; and as the law of England
 " will not sweep away these solemn trusts at the bidding
 " of the vicars, it is sought to carry the object into effect
 " by the spiritual weapons of excommunication and ghostly
 " terror, should Propaganda give powers to wield such
 " questionable thunder for such still more questionable
 " purposes.

" Considerable funds and rents are held by laymen
 " in various countries in trust for Benedictine and Jesuit
 " missions ; but as these corporations are powerful at
 " Rome, no attempt is made just now at usurpation in
 " that quarter. The other lay-patrons of Roman Catho-
 " lic livings, holding such patronage according to the
 " canonical usage of all Catholic countries (in right of
 " original grants from the pockets of their ancestors), are
 " all about to be despoiled of their immemorial rights,
 " unless, being made aware of what is brewing in Rome,
 " they instruct Roman lawyers and agents to resist the
 " palpable spoliation, or, what would be more effectual,
 " bring the matter under the notice of Pius himself.

" The system by which the vicars themselves are
 " created is an anomaly unknown to Catholic Christen-
 " dom. There is no election by a parochial synod as in
 " Ireland : no principle of *detur digniori*. Caprice and
 " cabal influence the result, and men of mediocrity and
 " cunning will be sure to rise over the heads of such
 " men as LINGARD under the present arrangement. In
 " fact, understrappers at Propaganda settle the spiritual
 " affairs of Great Britain and her colonies just as they
 " like ; nor is it understood that these subaltern func-
 " tionaries (who have the power of suppressing or dis-
 " torting correspondence) are inaccessible to *persuasions*
 " of an *arithmetical character*."

Such is the picture of the way in which the Church
 is infallibly guided by an infallible priesthood, drawn by
 a priest himself at Rome ! Still we are told that this is
 only a question of titles, whereas we have it from the

testimony of priests themselves, that the titles are not empty sounds, but are realities which ensure the grasp of the property of the laity.

To clench the matter still more firmly, I will read a letter from a priest, dated this very year, 1851, Jan. 27:—
 “ I have information from Rome that there is prepared
 “ a brief *to force upon us the canon law of the DIOCESE*
 “ OF ROME. By that law bishops are, under their pri-
 “ mate, absolute masters of all church *temporalities*; and
 “ the great motive for the creation of a mock hierarchy
 “ was the introduction of the same canon law, and the
 “ annihilation, consequently, of all hope of *reviving the*
 “ *old free canon law of England* amongst us. THUS WOULD
 “ ROME SUCCEED FOR THE FIRST TIME SINCE THE CON-
 “ QUEST in her darling object, — the introduction of her
 “ own canon law into England, to be enthroned upon
 “ the ruins of an ancient and homely canon law; an
 “ object not the less cherished by her now that almost
 “ every Catholic country in the world — even Piedmont
 “ and Sardinia at last — has rejected her legislation.”

Another priest says, “ It is true that they pretend to
 “ confine it to spirituals, but with the Cardinalites the
 “ *distinction of spirituals and ecclesiasticals* is not recog-
 “ nised; and so spiritual in their mouths means all
 “ things relating to persons and rights ecclesiastical, as
 “ benefices, patrons, congregations, incumbents, church-
 “ lands, and the like. . . Cardinal Wiseman is determined
 “ to be paramount in spirituals first, and then in tem-
 “ porals. If he succeed, all liberty is lost to us, poor
 “ clergymen; AND SUCCEED HE WILL UNLESS PARLIAMENT
 “ INTERFERE TO SAVE US.”

It is clear, after this statement, that I am justified in saying that there is a portion of her Majesty's subjects entitled to protection from this aggression on their rights. Dr. Ullathorne, in one of his pastorals, lately says, “ Aye, but let us know who these priests are; whether
 “ they are in full communion with the Church, or not?” Dr. Ullathorne knew full well that if he could get hold of their names they would be dismissed instant, with-

out mercy and without redress. These men are mostly poor, without private funds, and, being bred up to be ecclesiastics, are incapable of exercising any other vocation, and therefore dismissal to them is synonymous with starvation. Cardinal Wiseman says, in his first Lecture on the Hierarchy, that “not one obtains any increased power or jurisdiction over clergy or laity, or property or trusts, or any person or thing.” The cardinal is contradicted by his priests as plainly as language can tell him: they tell him that his assertion is the very opposite of truth; in short, they say, *totidem verbis et totidem literis*, that it is directly false: and this Lecture of Wiseman’s is calculated to deceive the laity upon the extent of the power which he will henceforth have over their temporalities.

The power which the bishops possess has been exposed in some degree by Lord Shrewsbury, who has dared to let the cat out of the bag. In writing to Dr. M’Hale, his lordship says,—“Dr. O’Finnan, one of your grace’s suffragans, was dispossessed of his diocese at Killaloe, and another thrust into his place, as the successful issue of a petty intrigue at Rome.” Dr. Mulholland appealed to the Court of King’s Bench at Sligo, in 1837: but Mr. O’Connell advised him to submit, for no justice could be obtained for him.

It has been the fashion for many people to speak of the Papacy as a thing that is by no means in the present day that which it was in former times. The Popes, however, to do them justice, have never changed—have never abated one iota of their pretensions to the temporal as well as to the spiritual sovereignty of Christendom. When this is alleged, we are answered that we have been raking up musty records of bygone times, but that the principles of modern Romanists are totally different. Now I will defy any one to point out a doctrine of the Court of Rome which has been so continuously and unremittingly held as this. I have now before me extracts from the decrees of no less than twenty-one Popes and seven Councils, all claiming

the right to depose temporal sovereigns, and all putting the doctrine in practice—at least, absolving subjects from their allegiance, when they could not attain to the other. Gentlemen may deny this if they please,—if they find it convenient to answer present purposes; I will not venture to characterise such denials, but I will read to them what one of the Popes says of those who draw any distinction between his spiritual and temporal power. This infallible gentleman says that such deniers are “beasts,” “members of Satan,” and “limbs of Antichrist.” It is further worthy of remark, that none of the books which maintained the Pope’s temporal rights over all sovereigns have ever been placed in the “Index Expurgatorius,” whilst all which denied it have been. When it suited the purpose of Dr. Doyle to deny this, when Catholic Emancipation was wanted, he wrote to Lord Liverpool that “it must be quite obvious “that these claims had not their origin in the Gospel” (quite obvious indeed), “nor in the doctrine of the “Catholic Church,” (certainly in the doctrine of the Papal Church) “but in the state of society, in the “mistaken zeal, or in the ambition of some Popes; a “zeal or an ambition excited and directed by an insatiable avarice, pride, and thirst of power, in their “followers and dependants.” This he wrote in his “Essay on the Catholic Claims,” addressed to Lord Liverpool in 1826. It is a pity that we do not take a lesson from Roman Catholic powers, who know how to deal with the Pope’s claims far better than we do: and when the Pope wrote, “Boniface, Bishop, servant of “the servants of God, to Philip, King of France, fear “God, &c. &c.; we wish you to know that you are “subordinate to us both in spiritual and temporal concern;” the King wrote him back for answer, “Philip, “by the grace of God, King of France, to Boniface, “acting as Pope, little or no greeting: your superlative “foolishness is hereby informed, that in temporal concerns we are not subordinate to any one.”

Having then seen what are the Papal pretensions,

their extent, and the unabated claims, let us see what means the Pope has at his command of enforcing them. It is said that he has no troops, and but one corvette, and that it is absurd for us to have any apprehensions on that account. Pray, when had he ever an army and a fleet? He possesses the same power now that Popes ever had—the power of excommunication. Many persons in this House do not believe in the efficacy of sacraments, and these say that if men are such fools as to be frightened by the fear of being excommunicated, they must take the consequences. Such persons, however, are not competent judges, because they cannot enter into the feelings of those who have faith in sacraments, and I should be very sorry to see that faith shaken. This argument is like that which was commonly used at the time of the Relief Bill, when it was said that the disabilities were no hardship at all, for the Papists had only to become Protestants. The difference lies here, namely, that the sacraments were given by God as instruments of blessing to the people, but the priests have taken them, and made them the means of exalting themselves and of oppressing the laity. It is impossible for any deliverance from this oppression to come but from the laity themselves; Parliament cannot protect them, nor any law which it can pass; and one bad part of this bill is, that there were symptoms of the laity remonstrating against the decree of the Synod of Thurles, which this bill has now prevented their doing.

With this power of excommunication to back them, they reduce the laity to be the most abject of all slaves. We have heard just now something about advancement in evangelical holiness; now let us see what these words mean in the mouths of Popish priests. They teach that “it is especially conducive to advancement—nay, even necessary—that all yield themselves to perfect obedience, regarding their superior, *be he who he may, as Christ the Lord.*”

“All which” (*i. e.* certain exercises) “they shall do at the appointment and judgment of their superiors,

“to whom, as in the place of Christ, they owe subjection.”

“And let every one persuade himself that they who live under obedience should permit themselves to be moved and directed under Divine Providence by their superiors just *as if they were a corpse*, which allows itself to be moved and handled in any way; or *as the staff* of an old man, which serves him wherever and in whatever thing he who holds it in his hand pleases to use it. Thus obedient he should execute anything on which the superior chooses to employ him, in the service of the whole body of the Society, with cheerfulness of mind, and altogether believe that he will answer the Divine will better in that way than in any other which he can follow in compliance with his own will and differing judgment.”

Again: “In the first place, you must not behold in the person of your superior a man liable to error and weakness, but CHRIST HIMSELF, who is highest wisdom, immense goodness, and infinite love; therefore you must receive the voice and commands of your superior not otherwise than the voice of Christ.”

The priests having reduced the laity to this degraded condition of slavery, inform us next how they mean to use these “corpses” and “stuffs” in their hands. “It hath seemed good to us —, to declare that none of these constitutions, &c., shall make obligatory any sin, whether mortal or venial, unless the *superior may command it* in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of the vow of obedience; and that he may judge it conducive either to individual good or to the universal well-being of the Society.”

It is truly ludicrous to hear men talking in this House about civil and religious liberty, if they shall have submitted to a slavery like this. They enjoy here civil and religious liberty, because it is Protestantism that secures both for them; out of a Protestant country they dare not utter the words. Cardinal Wiseman has lately published a translation of the “Exercises of Loyola,” in

the preface of which he declares that "in the Catholic Church no one is ever allowed to trust himself in spiritual matters. The Sovereign Pontiff is obliged to submit himself to the direction of another in whatever concerns his own soul."* Here, again, if this is quoted, the ready answer is, "that it is only spiritual matters:" now let us see how much truth there is in that excuse. In the thirteenth of these Exercises we find, "That we may in all things attain the truth (that we may not err in anything), we ought ever to hold it as a fixed principle that what I see white I believe to be black, if the hierarchical Church so define it to be." This is the teaching which Cardinal Wiseman is come "out of the side of the Pope" to give us. Is there "spiritual" black and "spiritual" white? this is the "evangelical holiness" in which, according to the Cardinal, the laity are to be perfected. Priests that inculcate such principles as these are the Thugs of Christendom. For what are Thugs?—murderers: yes, but all murderers are not Thugs. Thugs are not only murderers, but they commit murder as an act of worship: so these priests inculcate lying as an act of worship of the God of truth—inculcate the saying that black is white when they know it to be black as a thing well-pleasing to God: this is what con-

* This sentence is a fair sample of the duplicity, half falsehood and half truth, which pervades all the teaching of the priests. "In the Catholic Church," this is the first time that any one, except the Jesuits, dared to advance such a proposition; therefore the Catholic Church means Cardinal Wiseman; no Pope, no Council, has ever said so. It is the first attempt that has been made to rivet this tyranny on the necks of the English laity, and to make them lie, saying black is white and white is black, at the will of the priests. The laity in France and Italy have rejected this tyranny, priests and all; it remains to be seen whether the English laity will be such cravens as to submit to it. It has grown up out of the immoral theology of the Jesuits, which is now also for the first time made the theology for the rule of the English priests, Liguori having adopted Busenbaum, which for a long time was repudiated at Rome for its immorality. I advise all into whose hands this speech may fall, to get "The Confessional Unmasked," published by Allman, 8 Amen Corner, Paternoster Row.

stitutes Thuggee. Never was degradation of the laity who submit to them so low as this : the Negro slave was not so oppressed ; in all the debates in this House, in all the evidence of cruelty committed upon him, it never yet was said that he was obliged to say sugar was sour, and limejuice was sweet. Such slavery degraded man from his moral dignity as man. “ An honest man’s the “ noblest work of God,”—not a quibbling theologian ; and it matters not to what sect a man belongs, if he is taught and permitted to lie. The authoritative doctrine now taught by the priests from Liguori is this : “ Although “ it is not lawful to lie, or to feign that which is not, it “ is, however, lawful to dissimulate that which is, or to “ cover truth with words, or with other ambiguous and “ indifferent signs, for the sake of a just cause, and when “ there is no necessity for confessing it.”*

The country is aroused and indignant from one end to the other, and it is a dangerous argument for gentlemen to use when they say that it has not yet expressed itself with sufficient unanimity. The people are a law-loving people ; they do not boast, like some in this House, that, pass what law you will, they will set about breaking it : they are looking to the heads of their respective parties to lead them, and they are looking to this House for effectual legislation to beat back the aggression perpetrated by Dr. Wiseman and his priests : but if you disappoint them,—if you will do nothing for them, you will compel them to take the law into their own hands. I am sorry that they should be driven to this ; I am sorry that they should be excited upon such a subject, nor shall they be by me ; but, excited or not, they shall hear the truth. I am no professional agitator—no trader in Conciliation Halls ; I hate all such Whig principles and Radical practices ; but do not fancy that Dr. Wiseman shall with impunity issue his edicts from

* “ Etsi licitum non est mentiri seu simulare quod non est, licet tamen dissimulare quod est, sive tegere veritatem verbis, aliisve signis ambiguis et indifferentibus, ob justam causam, et cum non est necessitas fatendi.”

the Flaminian Gate to establish Popish laws, and Popish practices, and Popish rule over the inhabitants of Surrey and Sussex, and that I and others are not to examine those practices, and to challenge his authority. Of course, when a nation is excited, many motives combine in producing one result; but amidst them all there is this one pre-eminent, which is a plain John-Bull love of truth and detestation of imposture, and of those who practise it. What! do you think that you can bring over here with impunity a cargo of blinking statues, of bleeding pictures, of liquefying blood, and of the Virgin Mary's milk?*

Let us turn now to the purely political project which this aggression entails. My honourable friend near me, (Mr. Newdigate) has already alluded to Cardinal Wiseman having adopted Thomas à Becket as his model. Now, be it remembered that a long struggle had been going on between the priests and the king, respecting

* I am told that some persons are so ignorant of the extent of the imposture practised by the priests, as to have imagined when I mentioned these words, that it was an invention of mine. I therefore give a few specimens of the same kind, now exhibiting in Rome; Christendom is full of such.

A LIST OF SOME OF THE IMPOSTURES OF THE ROMISH PRIESTS, AND THE PLACES WHERE THEY ARE EXHIBITED IN ROME.

Church of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme:—

The finger of St. Thomas with which he touched the side of our Lord. One of the pieces of money with which the Jews paid Judas. Part of the veil and hair of the Blessed Virgin. A bottle of the blood of our Lord. A bottle of the milk of the Blessed Virgin. The stone on which the angel stood, when he announced the incarnation to the Virgin.

Church of St. Cecilia:—

The great toe of the foot of St. Mary Magdalen. The milk of the Blessed Virgin.

Church of St. Como and Damian:—

A bottle of the milk of the Blessed Virgin.

Church of Santa Prasside:—

The shift of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The heads of St. Peter and St. Paul. The napkin with which the Lord wiped the

their being amenable to the king's courts; Becket was a meek, oily sycophant of the king, and the king, therefore, thought he would not go against him if he made him Archbishop of Canterbury; no sooner, however, was he there, than he espoused the party of the priests in endeavouring to withdraw them from the king's power. Dr. Wiseman says, "Fear not that the interests of religion will be jeopardised in my hands, least of all where the cause of the Holy See is particularly concerned." (We have seen that by his oath he is bound to fight for the Holy See against all others.) "Need I remind you or others of where or how I have been nourished in the faith—how from early youth, I have grown up under the very shadow of the apostolic chair; how, week after week, I have knelt at the shrine of Peter, and there sworn fealty to him; how I have served as good masters successive pontiffs, in their very households, and have been admitted to confidence, and, if I dare say it, friendship by them? And is it likely that I

feet of his Apostles. The clothes in which our Lord was wrapped at his birth. Part of the garment without a seam of our Lord.

St. Maria Traspontine:—

The column at which St. Paul was scourged. An image of Christ which spoke to the Apostles Peter and Paul when in torments. The milk of the Virgin Mary.

Church of St. John Lateran:—

Part of the arm of St. Helen. Part of the bones of Maria Salome, mother of St. John. A finger of St. Catherine. The bones of St. Mary Magdalen. Bones and veil of St. Barbara. Fingers of St. Joseph. Brain of St. Vincent. Bones of St. Francis. Blood and inside of San Filippo. Head of St. Zachary. Blood of St. Charles Borromeo. Head of St. Pancratius from which blood copiously ran for three days and three nights, while the Church was on fire. Bones of divers Popes. Bones of St. Lawrence. Bones of St. Andrew. Chin of John the Baptist. Hair and clothes of the mother of God. The cradle of our Lord. Blood and water which came out of the side of our Lord.

There is another too revolting to decency and reverence for our Blessed Lord, to write.

“ should be behind any other, be he neophyte or Catholic
 “ of the ancient stock, in defending *the rights of my holy*
 “ *Lord* and Master under Christ? or that I can require
 “ the summoning to watch with jealous eye any attempt
 “ to infringe them?” It was the rights of his holy Lord
 that Becket defended against the king, and which
 Cardinal Wiseman declares he will do also. “ The second
 “ altar at which I knelt in the Holy City was that which
 “ marks the spot whereon St. Peter cemented the founda-
 “ tion of his unfailing THRONE with his blood. The first
 “ was that of our own glorious St. Thomas. For two-
 “ and-twenty years I daily knelt before the lively repre-
 “ sentative of his martyrdom; at that altar I partook
 “ even of the bread of life; there for the first time, I
 “ celebrated the divine mysteries; at it I received the
 “ episcopal consecration. He was my patron, he my
 “ father, *he my model*. Daily have I prayed, and do
 “ pray to him, to give me his spirit of fortitude to fight
 “ the battles of the Church,—if necessary, unto the shed-
 “ ding of blood. And when withdrawn from the sym-
 “ bols of his patronage by the supreme will of the late
 “ pontiff, I sought the treasury of his relics at Sens, and
 “ with fervent importunity sought and obtained the
 “ mitre which had crowned his martyred head, and I
 “ took myself from the shrine of the great Confessor,
 “ defender of religious rights, St. Edmund, *a part of*
 “ *that right arm*, which so often was stretched forth to
 “ bless your forefathers.”

Cardinal Wiseman then, going forth in the spirit and
 power of Becket to fight for the Pope against all comers,
 is backed by a body of men who declare that “ that
 “ which seems to be the noble shout of offended British
 “ patriotism, is no more than the passionate cry of the
 “ spirit of darkness over that mighty demoniac of three
 “ centuries old, the established Protestantism of England.
 “ The established Church is *the* great opponent of Jesus
 “ Christ in this island. Add together all the dissenting
 “ sects, account their heretical tenets at the worst, num-
 “ ber up the deeds of hostility against the Catholic

“ Church—their crimes will be nothing in comparison
 “ with hers. She alone is the true embodiment of that
 “ sin for which Satan was cast out of heaven. The
 “ Pope comes forward and restores England to her place
 “ in the Christian Church. He makes no new claim to
 “ her obedience ; *he never yet ceased for a moment to*
 “ *demand the obedience of all baptized Christians.*”

Having got then an obedient band of slaves, who
 will swear that black is white and white is black, at
 his bidding, to carry on his war against everything
 established in England, the Pope’s doctrine on temporals
 is well expressed in another letter in cipher to his legates
 in France, under the First Consul : “ Not only has the
 “ Church continued to prevent heretics from possessing
 “ ecclesiastical property, but it has besides established,
 “ as punishment of the crime of heresy, the confiscation
 “ and loss of the goods possessed by heretics. This
 “ punishment is decreed regarding private property in
 “ the decretal of Innocent III., and for that which regards
 “ principalities, feoffs, it also is a rule of the canon law,
 “ in the chapter Absolutos XVI. of heretics, that sub-
 “ jects of a prince manifestly heretical, remain absolved
 “ from all homage, fealty, and obedience, (*rimangono*
 “ *assoluti da qualunque omaggio, fedeltà, ed ossequio*)
 “ towards the same ; no one, however little versed in his-
 “ tory, can be ignorant of the sentences of deposition
 “ pronounced by pontiffs and councils against princes
 “ who are obstinate in heresy. We are living in times
 “ so calamitous, and in such humiliation for the spouse
 “ of Christ, that it is not possible for her to use, nor
 “ expedient to mention, *these most holy maxims of just*
 “ *rigour* against the enemies and rebels against the faith.
 “ But if she cannot exercise her right to depose heretics
 “ from their principedoms, and to declare their goods for-
 “ feited, she can never formally permit principalities to
 “ acquire more, which would be to be robbed herself.
 “ Such an occasion to divide the church she will not
 “ give to the same heretics and infidels, who, insulting
 “ her grief, will say that they have at last found the

“ means to make her tolerant.”* Such was the Pope’s language in the lowest extremity under the First Consul, furnishing another proof, that, whether in adversity or in prosperity, the court of Rome had never lost sight of its ultimate object. It is not, therefore, a matter of surprise that the people are indignant and alarmed. Such language, and such plans, never will be tolerated, and let the consequences be what they may, the country will not submit to them.

There only remains now to consider the best way of resisting and throwing back upon the author this infamous aggression. The first words which I addressed to this Parliament were to call upon the noble Lord to fulfil his promises with respect to the Established Church in Ireland: this must be done. Secondly, there is no pretext for extending this Bill to Ireland; and to apply it to that country is manifestly uncalled-for and unjust. Thirdly, a law must be passed to prohibit the privy councillors of a foreign potentate from residing in this country without the license of the Crown. Fourthly, you must make all deeds done under the canon law null and void. Fifthly, you must extend the provisions of the Mortmain Act to all property of all sects, and take away from all priests the power of robbing men upon their deathbeds. I believe that you have come into such a position with regard to ecclesiastical affairs, that you cannot go on as you are. In that book which Papists are not allowed by their priests to read, there are several letters addressed to the laity, and two only specially addressed to bishops: to these bishops one of the first authorised teachers says, “Remember that the love of money is the root of all evil:” he does not say this in his letters to the laity, but only in those to the priests. I do not deny that in the early ages of Christianity good may have accrued to religion from the support of the State, but that day is gone by. I do not deny that even monkery may not have been a good way by which to

plant Christianity in a heathen land, and to act as a missionary system in the country ; but that end being once attained, monasticism is an unmitigated evil. The way to walk in the steps of our forefathers, and to imitate their example, is not to do all the things that they did, but to do our duty in our day and generation, as they did their duty in their day and generation. It is not peculiarly against the priests of the Church of Rome that I speak, save as they afford more striking instances of that spirit of domination which is common to all, and which you can never counteract but by refusing to all sects alike the support of the civil power for all property belonging to religious or benevolent institutions ; and I apply to the priests that which Cardinal Bembo said of the monks,—“ I meddle with reluctance in the concerns
 “ of priests, for I found therein all human wickedness
 “ concealed behind a diabolical hypocrisy.”

